

Met Office Upper Stratospheric and Mesospheric Analyses: Validation and Improvement of Gravity Wave Drag Scheme

Submitted by

David John Long

to the University of Exeter as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Mathematics, February 2011.

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material is included for which a degree has previously been conferred upon me.

.....
David John Long

Abstract

The global analysis fields of the Met Office stratospheric assimilated data set have been investigated. Systematic biases for select years were identified through validation with independent satellite observations. Particular attention was given to analyses from January 2005 to October 2009 produced from a 50 level (L50) configuration of the UM with model lid at ~ 0.1 hPa, and the impact on analyses fields from November 2009 to September 2010 when the middle atmospheric configuration of the UM was extended to ~ 0.01 hPa using 70 levels (L70).

Validation results from both the L50 and L70 analyses show that largest temperature biases occur at polar latitudes approaching the model lid in the mesosphere, exhibiting a clear seasonal cycle. Here cold biases in the winter season of the L50 analyses and warm biases in the summer season of the L70 analyses would strongly suggest that the mean meridional circulation in the mesosphere is underestimated, and that small scale gravity wave forcing supplied by the operational Ultra Simple Spectral Parameterisation (USSP) scheme is insufficient.

Based on the above validation results numerous experiments were conducted to investigate the temperature response in the mesosphere to increased gravity wave forcing. Such experiments concentrated on tuning the energy scale factor (β) in the USSP scheme and the application of a momentum conserving "opaque" lid. Furthermore, the impact of developing the USSP scheme to include direct heating from gravity wave induced turbulent dissipation was also investigated. Maximum temperature responses in the summer polar upper mesosphere of ~ 22

K were found when increasing the standard value of $\beta=0.1$ to $\beta=0.14$ combined with the application of an opaque lid. Magnitudes of direct heating rates due to gravity wave turbulent dissipation diagnosed via the USSP scheme were found to be consistent with previous estimates. However applying such heating would most likely have a negative impact on the L70 analyses, which already display warm biases in the upper mesosphere, strongly suggesting that additional physical processes such as eddy diffusion must also be accounted for when applying direct heating from gravity wave breaking.

Contents

Contents	4
List of Figures	9
List of Tables	12
1 Introduction	13
1.1 Introduction	13
1.2 Motivation	17
1.3 Thesis Structure	18
2 Background	21
2.1 Atmospheric Vertical Structure	21
2.2 The Observed Middle Atmosphere	23
2.2.1 Seasonal Cycle of Zonal Mean Temperatures	24
2.2.2 Seasonal Cycle of Zonal Mean Zonal Wind	26
2.3 Dynamical versus Radiative Forcing	29
2.3.1 Atmospheric Waves	29
2.3.2 Atmospheric Solar Tides	33
2.3.3 The Transformed Eulerian-mean Equations	34
2.3.4 Stratospheric Forcing and Circulation	38
2.3.5 Mesospheric Forcing and Circulation	41
2.4 The Semi-Annual Oscillation	46
2.5 Summary	47

3	Data Sets	49
3.1	Met Office Stratospheric Assimilated Analyses	49
3.1.1	Background	49
3.1.2	Unified Model Description and Changes	50
3.1.3	Model Levels	55
3.1.4	Observations and Changes	57
3.1.5	Summary of Changes	60
3.2	The Upper Atmosphere Research Satellite Microwave Limb Sounder	60
3.2.1	Background	60
3.2.2	Orbit and Coverage	62
3.2.3	Spatial Resolution	63
3.2.4	Sources of Error	63
3.2.5	Validation with Correlative Data Sets	64
3.3	The Earth Observing System Microwave Limb Sounder	64
3.3.1	Background	64
3.3.2	Orbit and Coverage	65
3.3.3	Spatial Resolution	65
3.3.4	Sources of Error	66
3.3.5	Validation with Correlative Data Sets	67
3.4	Sounding of the Atmosphere using Broadband Emission Radiometry	69
3.4.1	Background	69
3.4.2	Orbit and Coverage	70
3.4.3	Spatial Resolution	70
3.4.4	Sources of Error	71
3.4.5	Validation with Correlative Data Sets	72
3.5	Summary	73
4	Zonal Mean Temperature	75
4.1	L50 Analyses Climatology	75
4.2	Validation Procedure	79
4.3	L50 Monthly Zonal Mean Temperature Error	80

4.3.1	Lower Mesosphere Cold Bias	81
4.3.2	Impact of Dynamical Forcing	87
4.3.3	Impact of the Ozone Climatology	89
4.3.4	Stratopause Warm Bias	94
4.3.5	Impact of the Radiation Scheme	96
4.4	Climatological Comparison of L42 and L50 Analyses	100
4.5	L70 Analyses	104
4.6	L70 Monthly Zonal Mean Temperature Error	107
4.6.1	Lower Mesosphere	107
4.6.2	Impact of Increased L70 Model Lid	112
4.6.3	Upper Mesosphere	115
4.6.4	Impact of Radiative and Dynamical Forcing	118
4.6.5	Summary	124
5	Zonal Mean Zonal Wind	125
5.1	L50 Analyses Climatology	125
5.2	L70 Analyses	130
5.3	Summary	134
6	Gravity Wave Parametrization	135
6.1	USSP scheme	135
6.1.1	Background	135
6.1.2	Doppler Shifting	139
6.1.3	Launch Spectrum	141
6.1.4	Conservative Propagation and the Quasi-Saturation Spec- trum	143
6.1.5	Numerical Back-propagation	145
6.1.6	Momentum Flux Deposition	146
6.1.7	Model Lid Condition	148
6.1.8	Standard Parameters Values	151
6.2	Direct Heating Rates due to Gravity Wave Dissipation	152

6.2.1	Turbulent Diffusion and Dissipation	153
6.2.2	Theoretical Approach	155
6.2.3	One Dimensional Wave Energy Spectrum	158
6.2.4	Implementation of the Heating Rate Code	160
6.3	Summary	161
7	Off-line Estimates of Gravity Wave Drag and Direct Heating Rates	162
7.1	Off-line Drag Uncertainty	163
7.2	Off-line Momentum Flux Values	168
7.3	Off-line Drag Values	169
7.3.1	L50 Model	169
7.3.2	L70 Model	173
7.3.3	Comparison with Previous Studies	174
7.4	Off-line Turbulent Heating Rates	179
7.4.1	CIRA'86 Off-line Heating Rates	179
7.4.2	L70 Analyses Off-line Heating Rates	182
7.5	Off-line Drag Sensitivity Experiments	184
7.5.1	Previous Experiments and Constraints	185
7.5.2	Drag Sensitivity to Energy Scale Factor β	188
7.5.3	Drag Sensitivity to Un-saturated Spectral Power Law s	188
7.5.4	Drag Sensitivity to Opaque Lid Condition	191
7.6	Off-line Direct Heating Sensitivity Experiments	191
7.6.1	Heating Rate Sensitivity to Energy Scale Factor β	192
7.6.2	Heating Rate Sensitivity to Un-saturated Spectral Power Law s	193
7.7	Summary	194
8	Unified Model Experiments	197
8.1	Experimental Background	197
8.2	Control Run	199
8.3	USSP Tuning Experiment	207

8.4	Opaque Lid Condition Experiments	211
8.5	Gravity Wave Heating Rate Experiments	213
8.5.1	Opaque Lid Direct Heating Rates	214
8.5.2	Transparent Lid Direct Heating Rates	219
8.5.3	Statistical Significance of Experimental Results	223
8.5.4	Impact of Turbulent Eddy Diffusion	224
8.6	Summary	227
9	Conclusions	231
9.1	Conclusions	231
9.1.1	L50 Validation	232
9.1.2	L70 Validation	235
9.1.3	Off-line Studies	236
9.1.4	UM Experiments	238
9.2	Operational Considerations and Further Work	242
A	USSP Momentum Flux Profile	246
A.1	Derivation of momentum flux at z_k	246
A.1.1	Chop Type 0	246
A.1.2	Chop Type I	246
A.1.3	Chop Type II	248
A.1.4	Chop Type III	250
A.1.5	Chop Type IV	251